

REMARKS

Claims 1-97 are currently pending in the subject application, and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-53, 56, 58-60, 65-67 and 76-97 have been canceled. Claims 54, 55, 57, 60-64, and 68-75 are rejected. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

I. Objection to Claims 57, 60, and 62

Claims 57, 60, and 62 are objected to because of informalities. Claim 57 has been amended to properly depend from claim 54. Claim 60 has been canceled, thus rendering the rejection of claim 60 moot. Claim 62 has been amended to recite determining at least one said statistic for said related parameters from said one or more intermediate statistics, thus providing proper antecedent basis. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 57 and 62 is therefore respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 68-73 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 68-73 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,016,951 to Longworth, et al. ("Longworth"). Claims 68 and 73 have been amended. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 68 has been amended to recite providing said plurality of session related parameters to a data pipe configured to store a time-ordered series of sets of entries by storing said sets of entries at respective time positions of said data pipe, said data pipe comprising at each said time position a storage location allocated to each parameter of a set of expected parameters, said providing comprising writing session related parameters of a message into respective said storage locations corresponding to said session related parameters of said message. Amended claim 68 also recites operating a first query by reading parameters at a first said time position on said data pipe, storing a result of said first query in a said storage location of said data pipe, and operating a second query by reading parameters at a second said time position on said data pipe later than said first position and by reading said stored result.

In the Office Action dated November 5, 2009 (hereinafter "Office Action"), in rejecting claim 60, now canceled, the Examiner asserts that "Cranor further discloses 'providing captured network data for a communications session to a data pipe configured to store a time-ordered series of sets of entries...and reading parameters at a time position on said data pipe for a said formatted query' [based on] low-level FTAs are performed as the data comes in and results are fed to higher level FTAs and includes aggregating statistics based for time intervals," (Office Action, page 14; citing Cranor, paragraphs 15-17 and 40). Representative for Applicant respectfully disagrees, such that Cranor, individually or in combination with Longworth, does not teach or suggest amended claim 68 to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Cranor discloses that "queries are analyzed and broken up into component modules, which allow the network monitor to perform processing such as filtering, transformation, and aggregation as early as possible to reduce the resources required to monitor the traffic," (Cranor, paragraph 6). Cranor also discloses that "queries can be broken into two types of hierarchical processing modules--a low-level component that can run on the network interface card itself, thereby reducing data before it reaches the main system bus; and a high-level component that may be run in either the kernel space or the user space," (Cranor, *Id.*). Furthermore, Cranor discloses that "[t]his hierarchical division of processing allows the monitoring of high-traffic network links while maintaining support for a simple flexible query interface," (Cranor, *Id.*). Based on this, Cranor clearly demonstrates that the queries described in Cranor operate in different spaces (*i.e.*, different processing modules). Such querying in different processing modules described in Cranor achieves the goal stated in Cranor of "reducing data in key locations...as early as possible," (Cranor, *Id.*). The Examiner acknowledges this hierarchical querying described in Cranor by citing the LFTAs and HFTAs, which provide separate low- and high-level filtering, transformation, and aggregation, respectively (Cranor, paragraphs 15-17).

By contrast, amended claim 68 recites operating first and second queries from the same data source (*i.e.*, the data pipe). Accordingly, Cranor fails to teach or suggest operating a first query by reading parameters at a first said time position on said data pipe, storing a result of said first query in a said storage location of said data pipe, and operating a second query by reading

parameters at a second said time position on said data pipe later than said first position and by reading said stored result, as recited in amended claim 68, to one of ordinary skill in the art. Representative for Applicant further respectfully submits that Cranor likewise fails to teach or suggest a data pipe comprising at each said time position a storage location allocated to each parameter of a set of expected parameters, said providing comprising writing session related parameters of a message into respective said storage locations corresponding to said session related parameters of said message, as also recited in amended claim 68.

The addition of Longworth fails to cure the deficiencies of Cranor to teach or suggest claim 68 to one of ordinary skill in the art. Longworth discloses executing query mechanisms against a session database (Longworth, col. 1, line 65). However, Longworth fails to disclose operating first and second queries from the same data source (*i.e.*, the data pipe), and thus further fails to teach or suggest the elements of amended claim 68 to one of ordinary skill in the art. Accordingly, for these reasons, neither Cranor nor Longworth teach or suggest claim 68 to one of ordinary skill in the art. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 68, as well as claims 69-72 which depend therefrom, is respectfully requested.

Claim 73 has been amended in a manner substantially similar to claim 68. Therefore, for the reasons described above regarding claim 68, neither Cranor nor Longworth teach or suggest claim 68 to one of ordinary skill in the art. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 73, as well as claims 74 and 75 which depend therefrom, is respectfully requested.

For the reasons described above, claims 68-73 should overcome the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 54, 55, 60-64, 74 and 75 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 54, 55, 60-64, 74 and 75 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0187977 to Cranor, et al. ("Cranor") in view of Longworth. Claims 54 and 64 have been amended in a manner that is substantially similar to the claim 68. Thus, for the reasons described above regarding claim 68, neither Cranor nor Longworth teach or suggest claims 54 and 64 to one of ordinary skill in the art. Withdrawal of

the rejection of claims 54 and 64, as well as claims 55, 57, and 61-63 which depend from claim 54, is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and that the application be passed to issue.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees for this amendment to our Deposit Account No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5 April 2010

/Christopher P Harris/

Christopher P. Harris
Registration No. 43,660

CUSTOMER No.: 26,294

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL, & TUMMINO L.L.P.
1300 EAST NINTH STREET, SUITE 1700
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114
Phone: (216) 621-2234
Fax: (216) 621-4072